

REMARKS

The Official Action of June 19, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application remain claims 1-11, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-11 remain in the application for consideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her indication that claims 1-11 would be allowable subject to being rewritten to overcome her 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to eliminate the problems identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection has now been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently

Appln. No. 10/529,875
Amdt. dated September 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 19, 2006

pertinent to warrant their applications against any of
applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\R\Renb\Bouvet2\pto\2006-09-14 Amendment-A.doc